



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/871,458

05/31/2001

Philip Shafer

1014-007US01

9813

28863 7590 10/21/2004

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P. A.
8425 SEASONS PARKWAY
SUITE 105
ST. PAUL, MN 55125

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/871,458

Applicant(s)

SHAHER, PHILIP

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,14,15,27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-13,16-26 and 29-38 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-38 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozzie et al., US pat. No.6,640,241 in view of Rosenthal, US pat. No.5,964,844.

As to claims 1 and 14, Ozzie discloses a method comprising: establishing a secure connection between a network router (318 fig.3) and a client (311 fig.3); initiating a command process on the network router and receiving from the client a command (processing requests from clients, see fig.3, col.10 line 56 to col.11 line 20); and in response to the command, accepting commands encoded in accordance with an extensible markup language (using XML in processing requests, see fig.4, col.11 line 22 to col.12 line 54).

Ozzie dose not specifically disclose using a command line interface (CLI). However, Rosenthal in the same network environment discloses a command line interface (CLI) (see col.3 line 64 to col.4 line 38). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Rosenthal's command line interface into the computer system of Ozzie to identify a command object because it would have enabled users to identify the command object in the command buffer and minimized the need to maintain the code located in different places in a communications network.

As to claims 2 and 15, Ozzie discloses accepting commands comprises replacing the CLI process with a management server process that provides an extensible markup language-based application programming interface (API) to the client (processing data using APIs, see col.12 lines 12-53 and col.13 lines 9-67).

As to claim 27, Ozzie discloses a network router management interface comprising: a secure protocol module that provides a secure connection between a network router (318 fig.3) and a client (311 fig.3) a command module that receives commands from a client (processing requests from clients, see fig.3, col.10 line 56 to col.11 line 20); and a management server module (310 fig.3) that receives the commands from the module and in response to one of the commands, accepts commands encoded in accordance with an extensible markup language (using XML in processing requests, see fig.4, col.11 line 22 to col.12 line 54).

Ozzie dose not specifically disclose using a command line interface (CLI). However, Rosenthal in the same network environment discloses a command line interface (CLI) (see col.3 line 64 to col.4 line 38). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Rosenthal's command line interface into the computer system of Ozzie to identify a command object because it would have enabled users to identify the command object in the command buffer and minimized the need to maintain the code located in different places in a communications network.

As to claim 28, Ozzie discloses that the management server module accepts the commands by replacing the CLI module with the management server module and providing an extensible markup language-based application programming interface (API) to the client (processing data using APIs, see col.12 lines 12-53 and col.13 lines 9-67).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 3-13, 16-26 and 29-38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

None of the cited prior art discloses a network router management interface comprising a combination of: receiving from the client, following the replacement of the CLI process, configuration requests and operational requests encoded with extensible markup language tags; accessing a network management interface schema that maps the extensible markup language tags to configuration and operational information

Art Unit: 2151

associated with software modules running on the network router, the software modules including a chassis software module that defines an inventory of components in the network router chassis, a device configuration software module that defines a physical configuration of the network router, and a routing protocol module that administers protocols supported by the network router; parsing the configuration requests and the operational requests; accessing the corresponding configuration and operational information associated with the chassis software module, the device configuration software module, and the routing control software module according to the network management interface schema; and emitting replies encoded with extensible markup language tags according to the network management interface schema.

Other prior art cited

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Davidson et al, US pat. No.6,671,869.
- b. Gelvin et al, US pat. No.6,735,630.
- c. Goldberg et al, US pat. No.6,434,543.
- d. Wollrath et al., US pat. No.6,654,793.


Conclusion

6. Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 27 and 28 are rejected.
7. Claims 3-13, 16-26 and 29-38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (703) 308-6687. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire THREE months from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U. S. C. Sect. 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(A).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.


Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2151
10/16/2004